

Gary L. Allen

Renewable and Alternative Power 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue Rosemead, CA 91770 Phone: 626-302-9612 Fax: 626-302-9622 Email: gary.allen@sce.com

April 9, 2008

Mr. Ryan Pletka Black & Veatch Corporation 2999 Oak Rd, Suite 490 Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Subject: SCE's Amended Comments the RETI Phase 1A Draft Report

Dear Ryan:

SCE appreciates the opportunity to comment on the March 14, 2008 RETI Phase 1A Draft Report. These comments are provided in the following paragraphs.

- 1. The cost ranges associated with many of the renewable technologies are not representative of the bids that SCE has received. In particular, some are significantly higher than what we have observed (solar). Further, in some cases onshore wind, for example -- the ranges are so wide as to render them virtually meaningless.
- 2. Black & Veatch ("B&V") has not included any integration costs for wind or solar in its analysis. Several studies have been performed around the country. While the debate is still on-going regarding the "right" value to use for integration costs, at least these studies have indicated that the values should be non-zero However, these estimates may be too low for California's circumstances with natural gas resources on the margin and providing the basis for operating reserve resources. Also, many of these studies were done prior to the recent increases in gas prices. Further, integration costs are not linear and likely will increase significantly as penetration increases. Whatever value is used must consider the specifics of the location in question, such as the intermittent penetration level, the intermittent generation production characteristics, and the cost of operating reserves.
- 3. B&V, as well as some of the members on the Stakeholder Steering Committee, seems to prefer making the CREZs larger in MW terms because of perceived economies of scale. While there may be some merit to this approach in theory, as the CREZ expands geographically, the ability to develop a definite method of service transmission plan is diminished correspondingly and, as a result, defining projected transmission costs with precision becomes increasingly speculative.

Mr. Ryan Pletka Black & Veatch Corporation April 9, 2008

4. The report lacks sufficient detail regarding potential renewable rich resource areas. Significantly greater detail is required in Phase 1A to achieve the desired outputs of Phase 1B. Specifically, the Draft Phase 1A report only states that solid biomass, solar PV and thermal, small hydro, onshore wind and geothermal in California will be evaluated in Phase 1B. In Phase 1A, RETI should have been able to specify the locations of these potential resources, not just the resource types. For example, the Phase 1A report could and should identify, for example, solar in eastern San Bernardino County and geothermal in Salton Sea, Mono Lake and western Nevada areas. The Phase 1A Draft Report effectively kicks the can down the road to Phase 1B, and will require a much more intensive effort in Phase 1B to produce the details necessary to make RETI useful.

Sincerely,

Gary Allen

Cary Alle-

cc: Black & Veatch (Tim Mason): MasonT@bv.com Clare Laufenberg Gallardo: <u>Claufenb@energy.state.ca.us</u> RETI Coordinating Committee Members

RETI Stakeholder Steering Committee Members